

INITIALED FILE COPY
Classification of Programs

AG to RMP Mar. 26/29

906
Program - *getty*

<i>RAL</i>		<i>BR</i>	
<i>mk</i>	APR 17 29	<i>mk</i>	
	Apr. 10, 1929	R.M. Pearce	
		A. Gross	

Your memorandum on Classification of Programs is excellent and in everyway satisfactory as a working chart. From the point of view of the work in Paris I see no difficulties, but I want to be sure to avoid any confusion in relation to budgeting and to insure every possibility of Paris control rather than New York approval. Allowing the program to stand as you have it, may I point out that we cannot yet make a final decision about

- 1) Aid for publications, as this program is not yet decided. We therefore have no policy and do not know whether these expenditures will be handled in New York or Paris
- 2) Aid for leaders has not been settled yet, but in that its purpose will involve large sums, will in all probability necessitate final decisions in New York
- 3) Fluid research has been settled as a matter of policy ~~subject to appropriation~~ ~~and transfer~~ but here again the sums involved will probably be large. I think you are right in assuming that you will have little opportunity of putting this program into effect in Europe within a year or two. When you do reach this stage it may be advisable to have the final decisions in New York

More about these things later.

The immediate problem as I see it is to take your classification and see how present appropriation totals may be adjusted under your various headings for the year 1930. I refer to those appropriations which are controlled entirely by the Paris office without reference to New York:

Fellowships	_____	\$100,000
Research aid	_____	25,000
Developmental aid	_____	
program	_____	150,000
Total	_____	\$275,000

These figures should be readjusted, on the basis of your plan, excluding from the Paris budget in addition to 1), 2) and 3) above the following:

- 4) Visiting commissions and professors from Europe to the United States and other countries than those in Europe
- 5) MRC and NDW fellowships

April 10, 1929

in your readjustment of the \$275,000 (or more or less as you may determine the needs for 1930) you should include all items in your table except my 1), 2), 3), 4) and 5) above, with the understanding that later as policies are adjusted, some of these items 1-5 may eventually fall into the Paris budget after policy is determined and new activities are assigned to Paris control. I think however that for all practical purposes your 1930 budget to be controlled and expended in Paris may exclude 1-5.

One problem arises in the adjustment of the Research Aid Fund and the Developmental Aid Program. We have decided here that the Research Aid Fund (\$25,000 for MS in Paris for 1929) is to cover expenditures made once only for a terminating project. Much of your aid under the Developmental Program is continuous and must therefore be placed in some separate category. I can still think of no better term than Developmental Program, but can readily see how in your classification the items may be scattered under the various headings you give. This of course is for you to decide. I suppose we must also keep in mind that aid might be given one year from the Research Aid Fund and then if we decide to continue it for a period of years it could be so continued under some other heading. To return to your classification, our present Research Aid Fund (\$25,000) according to our view would include the following items of your classification:

- a) Grants in aid
- b) Laboratory equipment to returned fellows
- c) Travel of professors in Europe
- d) Travel of advanced men in Europe
- e) Conference expenses (not to include attendance at scientific meetings or congresses)

April 10, 1929

- f) Laboratory equipment for traveling fellows (if not charged to fellowship budget and not recurring)
- g) Laboratory equipment for Developmental aid fellows (if not charged to Developmental Aid budget and not recurring)
- h) Literature (if not recurring)
- i) Aid to promising men " " "
- j) Holding men at important work " " "
- k) Aid to London units " " "

Under continuing aid I find it difficult to make a classification because I do not entirely understand your estimate in your financial table (page 4) of \$100,000 for Fellowship fund. Are we to assume that under this sum you will include both traveling and Developmental Aid resident fellows? MRC and NDW fellowships should not be included in your Paris office fellowship budget as these funds are appropriated directly to the MRC and the NDW. Do you mean that you plan to cut traveling and developmental aid resident fellowships (Italy, France and Ireland), to \$70,000? It would seem to me difficult, but if this is your plan I have only approval of and praise for it. If this is your plan the only continuing programs as I see it are:

I. Laboratory aid for Developmental aid fellows, if recurring

II. " " " traveling fellows " "

III. Literature (for several years)

IV. Aid for promising men (for several years)

V. Holding men at important work " " "

VI. Aid to London units " " "

All the above items I assume may cover several years of assistance. It is possible that aid to the London units might better be considered under the Fluid Research Fund, especially if agreement could be reached with the MRC.

April 10, 1929

On the basis of these notes, and keeping in mind that I am not quite clear as to your intent in regard to the Fellowships and the Developmental Aid Program, see what you can do with the \$275,000 mentioned above. With the exclusion of 1-5 covered in the early part of this memorandum you can follow your classification and bring all the items in your classification, as far as budgeting is concerned, under three items - Research Aid Fund, Continuing Programs, Fellowship Programs.

I may be stupid about all this, but if so you will of course give me further light.

Now as to notes and queries in your table:

a You have to settle this. The real question is whether to charge equipment to Research Aid Fund or to Fellowship appropriation.

b No comment except that as result of recent correspondence with JAMA we should like to know procedure. Do you, or do recipients, place the orders and pay the bills in every instance?

c This is not important, but we consider Research Aid Fund should be for small sums of a few hundred dollars, up. We have set no figure for the United States as we do not intend to handle these small funds directly. If we make an arrangement with the NRC to handle funds we shall probably leave to them decision as to any single item under \$5000. The NRC however will have a much larger total than you will have at present, and you might well place your upper figure at a somewhat lower level.

d This is for you to decide.

e No comment, but I should like to be sure where you will charge in 1930 the stipends for resident fellows under your present Developmental Aid Program. I have in mind your large commitments in Italy, France and Ireland.

April 10, 1929

f and g I am not sure I understand your plan, but I gather that hereafter the Developmental Program as such will no longer exist, but will be broken up under headings of Equipment Fund and Fellowship Fund.

Now as to the items opposite which you place question marks, taking them column by column from the left:

Aid to promising men, and
Holding men at important work These may I imagine be considered together.

You could doubtless do much for them under other items of your program, as Laboratory equipment, Grants in aid, etc., but I assume you mean more or less continued support as in the case of Cairns, or pediatrics at Barts, etc. We have no final decision as yet in the New York office and probably shall work out a program as cases are presented. Policy will probably vary. I should hope that in time the Paris budget might contain an item covering this effort. If you wish to include one for 1930 well and good.

Fluid research. In this office we are considering large sums for a period of three to five years for a school or a large group within a university.
and
This aid will cover material/assistants. The only New York example so far is grant of \$20,000 a year for each of five years for the Rochester Medical School. You might study this in the docket of the March 8 Executive Committee meeting. I agree that you should go slowly on this program in Europe for there you would probably get better results by aiding individuals or departments through a continuation or modification of your Developmental program. In any event I think the New York office would prefer for a period of a year or so to pass on Fluid Research aid funds in order that we may reach a common point of view.

Aid to London units. The only ones I suppose worthy of consideration are those of University College and the units of MacLean, Frazer and Ellis, and pos-

April 10, 1929

sibly Gask - the others not worth while. These I suppose could be helped under your Research aid program if the amounts needed are small and not recurring. On the other hand, if for larger amounts and recurring, five-year periods of Fluid research fund might be considered at whatever level would indicate wise use. (1) Barts, including medicine, surgery, pediatrics. (Do you know Gask and is he doing much in research?) (2) London, medicine and Cairns, and possibly pathology on the basis that pathology might help out the first and second of these. If you did this you might in time drop the individual aid to Cairns. (3) St. Thomas, MacLean. I know of no other department of St. Thomas that could be put into a group for Fluid research fund. Possibly therefore MacLean might better be aided as a leader. (4) University College, medicine, surgery, obstetrics, pediatrics. — As you think about Fluid research fund you might experiment with one or more of the above possibilities, always keeping in touch with Fletcher so that the Research Council may not let down on its support and in order also that we may feel we are wisely supplementing other efforts. In this particular field however I should like to know in advance what you are planning so that you might keep in touch with the New York point of view as to scope and procedure in Fluid research funds.

Publications. Covered in first paragraph above.

Conference expenses. These come under Research aid fund. Decision in Paris - no reference to New York. Intended for individuals or small groups to get together to discuss research problems in their fields - not for attending scientific meetings or congresses.

Aid to leaders. Until program is worked out through consideration of specific cases as they develop, decisions must be made in New York. Will probably run into large sums, and theoretically at least should lead to aid in institutions in which the individual is working (e.g. Vogt). Compare II - 1 & 2, and IV - 1 & 2

April 10, 1929

of January 3 outline. Here for example could be included your plan of life support of a leader, pension, etc.

Summary

1. Your general outline approved as a working scheme if adjustments can be made with the trustees' appropriations and due regard to Paris and New York responsibility.
2. Certain phases of our program are not yet settled.
3. I am not certain as to the interpretation of your financial statement (\$210,000) as it applies to Developmental program and Fellowships.
4. I have tried to throw light on various lines of effort and to clear up possible differences of interpretation in view of the fact that New York and Paris discussions may start from different points and tend to widely varying conclusions.
5. The important point to settle before the end of the year is to allocate tentatively for 1930 the present appropriations controlled by the Paris office totaling \$275,000 which can be handled without reference to New York, and to add to these other items which you think essential for a budget to be controlled in Paris for that year.

I am sorry this is so long, but it seems worth while to go into detail in order that we may eventually reach a common point of view.